



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/840,772 | 04/23/2001 | Endong Xun | MS1-553US | 4242 |

22801 7590 12/12/2006
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SERROU, ABDELALI

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2626

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/840,772

Applicant(s)

XUN, ENDONG

Examiner

Abdelali Serrou

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 58-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 58-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. In response to the Final Rejection filed on 9/1/2006, the applicant has submitted a Request for Continued Examination with an amendment, filed on 11/1/2006, amending independent claims 1, 14, 58, and 61 to overcome the references used.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The amended Office Action is given bellow.

Claim Rejection 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

Claims 1- 3, 5-8, 10-11, 14, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duan et al. (U.S 6,778,949, filed on Oct. 18 and issued on Aug. 17, 2004) in view of Sueda et al. (U.S 5,854,997, issued on Dec. 29, 1998).

As per claims 1, 14, 58, and 61, Duan et al. teach:

a parser for parsing selected text into individual translation units (relies on a conventional parsing method to build the nodes in a syntax parse tree that builds a parse tree from the leaf nodes to the root node (col. 9, lines 34-39);

a word translation selector for choosing for the translation units an expression in a source language into an output expression in a target language for the translation units (col. 2, lines 16-17); and

a translation generator for translating the candidate word into corresponding words or phrases in the native language that can be presented to the inherent user interface (Figs. 7 and 2a, which represents a generation tree translation.

Duan et al. do not explicitly teach a user interface to allow a user to select an existing text for translation from a source language (i.e. English) to a target language (i.e. Chinese), and displaying text translation adjacent to the text, the user has selected for translation.

Sukeda in the same field of endeavor teaches a user interface that displays text translation adjacent to the text, the user has selected for translation (Fig. 5a), and allows a user to select an existing text for translation from a source language (i.e. English) to a target language (i.e. Chinese) (Fig. 5a, and Fig. 9, steps 908-911, wherein the system asks the user through a user interface (display screen) to choose or select the sentence desired for translation, and displays the translation of the selected sentence). Furthermore, Sukeda's system provides translation between English and Chinese (col. 8, lines 4-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the display feature of Sukeda to the system of Duan et

Art Unit: 2626

al., because this would improve sharply the efficiency of the translation processing by having a sample, compact, and inexpensive electronic interpreter (col. 1, lines 36-42).

As per claim 2, Duan et al. teach a morphological analysis module 206 which takes text input 202 and uses a source language dictionary 204 to decompose the words into morphemes by identifying root forms, grammatical categories, thesaurus information, and other lexical features of the words (col. 5, lines 51-55).

As per claim 3, Duan et al. teach a part-of-speech/base noun phrase identification module for tagging individual words with identifiers (syntax parse tree, Fig 2a).

As per claim 5, Duan et al. teach a phrase extension module (an expansion function, col. 11 lines 35-50) for applying phrase extension rules to individual words.

As per claims 6-8, Duan et al. teach a system of a dictionary module for translating the candidate word translations into the corresponding words or phrases, a word dictionary and phrase (multiword) dictionary (col. 6, lines 32-33).

As per claim 10, Duan et al. teach a template module (Fig 2a, element 208) that can be used to translate the candidate word translations into the corresponding words or phrase (col. 8, lines 26-33).

As per claim 11, Duan et al. teach rules module (col. 5, lines 43-50) that contains multiples rules for translating non-native language words into native language words.

As per claim 59, Duan et al. teach a morphological analysis module 206 which takes text input 202 and uses a source language dictionary 204 to decompose the words into morphemes by identifying root forms, grammatical categories, thesaurus information, and other lexical features of the words (col. 5, lines 51-55).

As per claim 60, Duan et al. teach a phrase extension module (an expansion function, col. 11 lines 35-50) for applying phrase extension rules to individual words.

As per claims 4 and 12, the Duan et al. in view of Sueda's reference teaches a reading system comprises of all the limitations of claim 3 upon which claim 4 depends.

Duan et al. in view of Sueda do not explicitly teach a statistical model.

McCarley et al. in the same field of endeavor teach a statistical model (col. 7, lines 59-67, and col. 8, lines 1-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine Duan et al. and Sueda with McCarley et al. by adding the statistical model to the reading system, to disambiguate a source language text and translate it into most likely target language sentences.

As per claims 13 and 15, the Duan et al. in view of Sueda teach a reading system comprising of all the limitations of claims 1 and 14 upon which these claims depend.

Duan et al. in view of Sueda do not explicitly teach a browser.

McCarley et al. in the same field of endeavor teach a browser (col. 2, lines 31-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to combine Duan et al. and Sueda with McCarley et al. in the reading system to also enable translation of foreign language information on the web.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duan et al. in view of Sueda, as applied to claims 1 and 6, in view of Corbonell et al. (U.S. 6,139,201 filed April 15, 1996).

Duan et al. in view of Sueda do not teach an irregular morphology dictionary.

Carbonell et al. in the same field of endeavor teach an irregular morphology dictionary (a listing of irregular morphological forms, col. 17, lines 21-29 and col. 18, lines 10-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have added Carbonell's teaching of irregular morphology dictionary to the Duan et al. and Sukeda's method of analyzing and manipulating linguistic structures, so as to have a more versatile system with rules not only for the regular verb morphology (the default rule), but also for the regular types of verb morphology.

Conclusion


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelali Serrou whose telephone number is 571-272-7638. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis I. Smits can be reached on 571-272-7628. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A. Serrou
12/9/06



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER (C-1)